Annex C: Evaluation model

1 Evaluation criteria

1.1 General information

The contract will be awarded to the tenderer having submitted the most economically advantageous tender based on the award criteria used. The award criteria are comprised by tender price and quality criteria.

It is important to note that a tenderer has to fulfil the requirements in **Annex B: Requirements on the Tenderer** in accordance to be eligible for consideration for the following evaluation.

1.2 Tender price

The tender price is only used for the comparison of tenders and does not represent the total value of the contract. However, the hourly fees offered will be incorporated into the framework agreement.

The tender price is calculated as follows:

$$((\text{number of Senior Consultants offered} \times \text{Senior Consultant hourly fee}) + (\text{number of Midlevel Consultants offered} \times \text{Midlevel Consultant hourly fee}) + (\text{number of Junior Consultants offered} \times \text{Junior Consultant hourly fee}))/\text{total number of consultants offered} = \text{tender price}$$

1.3 Quality criteria and added value

1.3.1 General information

Quality criteria are graded in accordance with the following:

Fulfilment of criterion with no added value	= 0 points
Fulfilment of criterion with minor added value	= 2 points
Fulfilment of criterion with added value	= 4 points
Fulfilment of criterion with significant added value	= 6 points
Fulfilment of criterion with exceptional added value	= 8 points

Each point corresponds to a certain added value expressed as a monetary amount. The added value is based on the relative weighting of the quality criteria. The following quality criteria and corresponding added values are applied:

ID*	Quality criterion	Weighting (as percentage of quality)
1.3.2	Methodology	20%
1.3.3	Organisation and staffing	10%
1.3.4	Availability	10%
1.3.5	Competence and qualifications	35%
1.3.6	Non-financial audits	5 %
1.3.7	Local audits	15 %
1.3.8	Related services	5 %

Tenders are assigned a mark-up based on the difference between the max points and points received for each criterion. The mark-up is calculated as follows:

$$Mark\text{-}up = ((max\ points - points\ received)/(max\ points\text{-}min\ points)) \times max\ value\ added$$

1.3.2 Methodology (20%)

The presentation of the methodology **should**:

- show that the Tenderer has a solid understanding and experience of the services and its role and responsibilities
- describe the Tenderer's methods used to carry out financial audit services in accordance with these Terms of Reference.

1.3.3 Organisation and staffing (10%)

The presentation of the organisation and staffing **should** show that it:

- is clear, transparent and well suited to the purpose and objectives of the services
- is designed to ensure that personnel with adequate qualifications and experience are assigned to perform the services
- is designed so that roles and responsibilities are as clear as possible, and communication between SIWI and the Tenderer consists of as few contact persons as possible on the side of the tenderer.

1.3.4 Availability (10%)

The tender **should** include a description of the time required for personnel to be able to begin work on a specific financial audit assignment after receiving a call-off order, using one of the following intervals:

Short-term assignments		Long-term assignments	
- 1–2 days	8 points	- 2–4 days	8 points
- 3–4 days	6 points	- 5–8 days	6 points
- 5–9 days	4 points	- 9–14 days	4 points
- 10–14 days	2 points	- 15–19 days	2 points
- More than 14 days	0 points	- More than 19 days	0 points

1.3.5 Competence and qualifications (35%)

The offered Senior Consultants **should** have extensive experience:

- of auditing in general;
- of auditing a variety of externally financed projects, especially development projects
- in accounting and financial management rules and practices;
- of working with non-profit organisations such as Non-Government Organisations and Civil Society Organisations
- of issues related to identifying and counteracting corruption and financial malpractice.

The offered Midlevel Consultants **should** have considerable experience:

- of auditing in general;
- of auditing a variety of externally financed projects, especially development projects
- in accounting and financial management rules and practices;
- of working with non-profit organisations such as Non-Government Organisations and Civil Society Organisations
- of issues related to identifying and counteracting corruption and financial malpractice.

The offered Junior consultants **should** have experience:

- of auditing in general;
- of auditing a variety of externally financed projects, especially development projects
- in accounting and financial management rules and practices;
- of working with non-profit organisations such as Non-Government Organisations and Civil Society Organisations
- of issues related to identifying and counteracting corruption and financial malpractice.

1.3.6 Non-financial audits (5%)

The Tenderer **should** have the capacity to perform the audit types described in **Annex A: Terms of Reference** Section 2.1 points 2-9 ("non-financial audits").

1.3.7 Local audits (15%)

The Tenderer **should** have the capacity to provide audits on location in the countries where SIWI's projects take place, as described in **Annex A: Terms of Reference** Section 2.3.

The description of the Tenderer **should** include an overall description the Tenderer's global reach, such as local member firms.

1.3.8 Related services (5%)

The Tenderer **should** have to provide capacity building (2,5%) and less complicated audit advice (2,5%) as described in **Annex A: Terms of Reference** Section 2.3.

SIWI may request that the tenderer provide less complicated advice concerning audit issues via email or telephone within one business day.

The tender **should** include brief descriptions of the related services provided by the Tenderer.

2   Evaluation model

2.1   Comparative figure

The most economically advantageous tender will be determined on the basis of a comparative figure, where the lowest comparative figure is the most economically advantageous tender.

The comparative figure is calculated as follows:

$$Comparative\ figure = Tender\ price + total\ mark\text{-}up\ for\ quality\ criteria$$

It is important to note that the comparative figure is only used for the purpose of comparison and does not reflect the actual tender price or the value of the contract.

2.2   Summary of the evaluation model

The evaluation model can be summarised as follows:

- The most economically advantageous tender is determined by a comparative figure which combines price and quality in monetary terms.

- The first component of the comparative value is the tender price. The tender price is calculated as sum of the number of consultants offered for different levels multiplied by respective hourly rates, divided by the total number of consultants offered.

- The second component of the comparative figure is the mark-up for quality. The mark-up is calculated as the difference between the maximum points and the number of points received for each quality criterion, divided by the maximum points and multiplied by the added value assigned to that criterion. The total mark-up represents the sum of these amounts. This means that the higher the quality is, and thus the greater the added value, the lower will be the mark-up.

- The most economically advantageous tender represents the lowest combination of tender price and mark-up.

Example:

EVALUATION OF TENDERS		Tender number	Tender 1		Tender 2	
		Name of Tenderer				
		Organisation number				
		Tender price	2 000		1 800	
Quality criteria	**Subcriteria**	**Weight in percent and SEK**	**Tender points**	**Value added**	**Tender points**	**Value added**
Methodology	Methodology	20,0%	933 kr	4	467 kr	4	467 kr
Organisation, staffing and availability	Organisation and staffing	10,0%	467 kr	6	117 kr	6	117 kr
	Availability	10,0%	467 kr	4	233 kr	4	233 kr
Competence and qualifications	Competence and qualifications	35,0%	1 633 kr	8	- kr	2	1 225 kr
Non-financial audits	Non financial audits	5,0%	233 kr	6	58 kr	4	117 kr
Local audits	Local audits	15,0%	700 kr	4	350 kr	6	175 kr
Related services	Internal capacity building	2,5%	117 kr	2	88 kr	6	29 kr
	Less complicated audit advice	2,5%	117 kr	6	29 kr	6	29 kr
Maximum points	8	**Sum**	40	1 342 kr	38	2 392 kr
Minimum points	0	**Comparative figure**		3 342 kr		4 192 kr
		Ranking	1		2	
		Succesful tenderer	YES		NO	

In the example above, Tender 1 is the most economically advantageous tender and Tenderer 1 is awarded the contract as the Successful Tenderer.